



IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re application of : **Confirmation No. 9005**  
Takashi KOMAI et al. : Attorney Docket No. 2003\_1593A  
Serial No. 10/697,878 : Group Art Unit 1623  
Filed October 31, 2003 : Examiner Layla D. Bland  
NOVEL ANTICOAGULANT : **Mail Stop: AF**

**RESPONSE UNDER 37.CFR.116  
EXPEDITED PROCEDURE  
EXAMINING GROUP** 1600

**RESPONSE AFTER FINAL REJECTION**

Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

THE COMMISSIONER IS AUTHORIZED  
TO CHARGE ANY DEFICIENCY IN THE  
FEE FOR THIS PAPER TO DEPOSIT  
ACCOUNT NO. 23-0975.

Sir:

Responsive to the Office Action of November 29, 2007, the time for responding thereto being extended for three months in accordance with a Petition for Extension of Time submitted herewith, Applicants submit the following remarks in support of the patentability of the presently claimed invention over the disclosure of the reference relied upon by the Examiner in rejecting the claims. Further and favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested in view of these remarks.

**Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §102**

Claims 1-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102 as being anticipated by Miyamoto et al. (Int. J. of Biol. Macromol. (2001) 28, pp 381-385). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for the following reasons.

"A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." MPEP §2131, citing *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). Applicants respectfully submit that each and every element of claim 1 is not expressly or inherently described by Miyamoto et al. The prior art does not describe an anti-coagulant